

REMARKS

With the foregoing amendment claims 2, 4-7, 9-11, 13, 14, and 16-34, are pending in the application. Claims 6, 10, 14, 21, 25, and 27 are independent. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 21-34 are allowed. Additionally, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 7, 11, and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

II. Claim Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Niikawa in view of Hirasawa. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent Claim 6

Claim 6, as amended, is patentable over Niikawa in view of Hirasawa because neither Niikawa nor Hirasawa, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features of claim 6. For example, at the least, neither Niikawa nor Hirasawa teach or suggest “a status display control device located on said back region that enables a user of the image capturing device to manually move said status information vertically and/or horizontally within said camera-back display,” as is recited in claim 6, as amended.

As correctly pointed out in the Office Action, Niikawa does not teach or suggest this feature of claim 6 (see Office Action, page 3 – “the claim differs from Niikawa in that the claim further requires that said status display control device controls horizontal and/or vertical movements of said status display within said camera-back display”). Additionally, the Examiner has also correctly pointed out that Hirasawa does not teach or suggest this feature (see Office Action, page 3 – “it is respectfully submitted that the examiner has not relied upon the teachings of Hirasawa to meet limitations of moving a status display within a

camera-back display.”). Because neither Niikawa nor Hirasawa teach or suggest “a status display control device located on said back region that enables a user of the image capturing device to manually move said status information vertically and/or horizontally within said camera-back display,” as is recited in claim 6, the rejection of claim 6 over Niikawa and Hirasawa should be withdrawn. It is well established that in order to reject a claim as being obvious over a combination of teachings, the prior art references when combined “must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.01 (emphasis added). In this case, neither Niikawa nor Hirasawa, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 6. Thus, the rejection of claim 6 (and all the claims that depend therefrom) should be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 10 and 14

With respect to claims 10 and 14, the above remarks apply because, like claim 6, claims 10 and 14 require a status display control device that enables a user of the image capturing device to manually move said status display vertically and/or horizontally within said camera-back display. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 10 and 14 (and all of the claims that depend therefrom) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
<i>NAME AND REG. NUMBER</i>	Brian Rosenbloom, Registration No.: 41,276				
<i>SIGNATURE</i>			<i>DATE</i>	9/15/05	
<i>Address</i>	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.				
<i>City</i>	Washington	<i>State</i>	D.C.	<i>Zip Code</i>	20005
<i>Country</i>	U.S.A.	<i>Telephone</i>	202-783-6040	<i>Fax</i>	202-783-6031